

Docket No. 36-0032 *C. Moore***IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of: )

Ramon Coronel, et al. )

Serial No.: 09/618,708 )

Filed: July 18, 2000 )

For: LARGE MULTI-FUNCTION  
INTEGRATED CIRCUIT DEVICE )

Group Art Unit: 2814

Examiner: Willie, Douglas A.

**CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office (FAX No. 703-872-9319) on 2/20/03

Marilyn L. Beaumont

Signature Marilyn L. Beaumont**PETITION TO THE COMMISSIONER UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.181****FAX RECEIVED**Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

FEB 20 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Sir:

Applicant petitions to request that the Examiner's restriction requirement in the application identified above be withdrawn and that the claims removed from consideration, except those cancelled by Applicant, be reinstated and considered by the Patent and Trademark Office in subsequent proceedings involving this application.

**STATEMENT OF FACTS:**

1. The Examiner made a telephonic restriction requirement on December 11, 2001, and asserted that there were four separate inventions, comprising:

Application No. 09/618,708

Docket No. 36-0032

- Group I: Claims 1-5 and 37
- Group II: Claims 6-18 and 38
- Group III: Claims 19-23 and 39
- Group IV: Claims 24-36 and 40

The undersigned attorney declined to make an election because claim 6 was a dependent claim of claim 1.

2. In an Office action dated January 22, 2002, the Examiner made the same restriction requirement in writing. In brief, the Examiner argued that Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination, that Inventions I and III are related as combination and subcombination, and that Inventions III and IV are related as combination and subcombination.

3. In a Response to Restriction Requirement filed February 5, 2002, Applicant argued that:

(a) Restriction as between Groups I and II was improper because the claims of Group II all depend from a claim of Group I.

(b) Restriction as between Groups III and IV was improper because the claims of Group IV all depend from a claim of Group III.

(c) Any claim that depends from an independent claim cannot be a subcombination of the structure defined by the independent claim, and this principle is made abundantly clear in the examples of combination and subcombination claims set forth in MPEP Section 806.05(c).

4. In an Office action dated March 4, 2002, the Examiner made the restriction requirement final.

Application No. 09/618,708

Docket No. 36-0032

5. In an Amendment filed July 3, 2002, Applicant again argued that the restriction requirement was improper, and requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the requirement.

6. In an Office action dated August 21, 2002, the Examiner noted that the restriction requirement was final and would not be considered further.

**ARGUMENT:**

Applicant has argued that a second claim that depends from a first claim cannot be a subcombination of the first claim. Further, a second group of claims, each member of which depends from one of a first group of claims cannot be said to define a subcombination of the invention defined by the first group.

In MPEP §806.05(c), example one, the following statement is made: "Where a combination as claimed does not set forth the details of the subcombination as separately claimed, the inventions are distinct and restriction is proper if reasons exist for insisting upon the restriction." (Emphasis added.)

When two claims are related as dependent and independent, the inventions defined therein are surely not "separately claimed" for purposes of restriction. The dependent claim includes, of course, all the features of the independent claim and cannot, therefore, define a "subcombination" of those features. Applicant has been unable to ascertain from the Examiner's actions which portions of the claims in question define a subcombination and which portions define a combination. For example, claim 1 as filed defines a combination of six recited elements, and claim 6 as filed depends from claim 1 and recites more specifically the structure of one of those elements. Yet claims 6 is said to define a different invention (Group II) from claim 1 (Group I). This

Application No. 09/618,708

Docket No. 36-0032

conclusion is logically inconsistent with the fact that claim 6 includes all of the features of claim 1.


Applicant believes that the Examiner's restriction requirement is totally at odds with the principles of restriction practice as defined in the MPEP, and in particular is inconsistent with the examples of proper restriction as set forth in the MPEP.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement are respectfully requested.

The Patent Office is authorized to charge the Petition Fee of \$130 to the Deposit Account 20-1515.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 20, 2003



Noel F. Heal  
Registration No. 26,074

Northrop Grumman Space Technology  
Intellectual Asset Management  
One Space Park, E2/6051  
Redondo Beach, CA 90278  
Telephone: (310) 812-4910  
FAX: (310) 812-2687

PTO/SB/07 (12-97)

Approved for use through 9/30/00. OMB 0651-0031

Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

2814

**Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the  
Patent and Trademark Office

on 02/20/03  
Date

**FAX RECEIVED**

FEB 20 2003

*Marilyn L. Beaumont*  
Signature

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Marilyn L. Beaumont

Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of transmission, or this certificate must identify  
each submitted paper.

The following papers listed below are submitted:

(13 pages, including transmittal cover) (FAX 703-872-9319)

1. Notice of Appeal from the Examiner to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in Duplicate
2. Petition to the Commissioner Under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.181 in Duplicate
3. Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) in Duplicate

Docket No. 36-0032

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.03 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.